W. F. Dancy

The North Carolina Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY
WILLIAM W. HOLDEN,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION OF THE STATES—THEY "MUST BE PRESERVED."

RALEIGH, N. C., WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 26, 1846.

VOLUME XII.—NUMBER 616.
TERMS—$3 PER ANNUM,
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

TERMS.

THE NORTH CAROLINA STANDARD
IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT
THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM—*IN ADVANCE.*

Those persons who remit by Mail (postage paid) Five Dollars, will be entitled to a receipt for Six Dollars or two years' subscription to the Standard—one copy two years, or two copies one year.

For *four* copies, : : : :	$10 00
" *ten* " : : : :	20 00
" *twenty* " : : : :	35 00

The same rate for six months.

☞ Any person procuring and forwarding five subscribers with the cash ($15,) will be entitled to the Standard one year *free of charge.*

ADVERTISEMENTS not exceeding *fourteen* lines, will be inserted *one time* for One Dollar, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion;—those of greater length, in proportion. *Court Orders* and *Judicial Advertisements* will be charged twenty-five per cent higher than the above rates. A deduction of 33 1-3 per cent. will be made to those who advertise by the year. ☞ If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out.

Letters to the Editor must come free of postage, or they may not be attended to

MR. HAYWOOD'S ADDRESS.

To the People of North Carolina:

I have never appeared before the public, by myself or otherwise, to write down an accusation against me, but have hitherto chosen to bear unjust rebuke in silence, and rely upon time, and my manner of life, to consign to oblivion the whisperings of the envious and the calumnies of the malignant. I do not affect to conceal, that a departure from this rule gives me much pain; and I am persuaded that if many of my friends did not think that it is a duty I owe to the people not to remain silent, under the recent censure of frenzied partisans, I should leave it, as far as concerns me, to my known character, and the self-denying act which has provoked it, to vindicate the patriotism and purity of my motives; reposing confidently upon the discernment and judgment of an intelligent public, in view of the simple facts as they occurred; and not doubting, that so soon as the occasion had passed by, and there was no longer a necessity for overawing others, who it might have been supposed, were more timid in their purpose, and no chance to deceive the people at the North Carolina elections, by unscrupulous libels against me, my assailants would cease from their "dirty work," and bad men, who measure the motives of the virtuous by a standard of morals which vice has erected in their own bosoms, would go hunting after some fresh victim to gratify their ignoble malice. But I come before you at this time to speak of myself, not of others, and to defend my own faithfulness, not to expose their designs; and I think myself happy that I have the honest people of North Carolina to judge my cause. I invoke no sympathy, I ask no compassion, and I thank God I need them not. But with the proud consciousness of one who has dared to do his duty as a servant of the republic, amidst dangers and trials such as, I trust, are not to grow common in our government, I stand before you to lay claim to the confidence, respect, and approbation of all good men, more especially of those belonging to the democratic party. I feel and know this day, and I will prove even to my enemies, that in my station as a senator, and in retiring from it, I incurred no guilt—I deceived no one—I betrayed no party—I made no sacrifice of your interests, and no surrender of your rights, —none at all, directly nor indirectly. And they who have charged the contrary, with all who, from any motive, personal or political, have given to it their aid and countenance, did "bear false witness."

It is true, that on the 25th of July, a few moments before the vote was expected to have been taken on the new tariff bill of 1846, (improperly called "McKay's bill,") I resigned my seat as a senator in Congress, into the hands of North Carolina, to whom it belonged; believing that it was my duty to do it, sooner than cast my vote against my own conscience, for a law that I could not approve, and knowing that it was my perfect right to do it, and that I would be but exercising that right in precise accordance with the last written doctrine of the legislature and of the party who elected me. In this only have I offended; and in manly sincerity, but with that plainness of speech which the humblest man in the community will be able to understand for himself, I proceed to lay before you my explanation.

The subject of the tariff, and the system of laws by which taxes are imposed and collected for the use of the general government throughout the Union, is one of deep importance, but of much intricacy and great difficulty in its judicious arrangement. Soon after taking my seat in the Senate of the United States, (in December, 1843.) I for one felt what any man when he first goes into Congress directly from private life will be apt to experience, and that was, a lack of necessary knowledge and information upon it. With an ambition to learn my duty as a legislator for this great republic, and a fixed determination to pursue it afterwards, I immediately gave my whole mind to the study and consideration of this tariff system, well knowing that upon it depended, in a good degree, the chief operations in commerce, agriculture, and manufactures, in other States as well as ours. During the first session of the last Congress, and after having devoted nearly all my time for some months to this study, I hoped I had made myself qualified, and my political associates believed me fit, to be consulted and counselled with, in our united efforts to arrange a tariff with justice to all sections, and with entire safety to the business, prosperity, harmony, peace, and independence of the Union. To admit that this could not be done, was to declare that the Union cannot be preserved, and the cause of free government had failed.

The democratic senators in particular, concurring as we did then, and do now, with a few exceptions at the north, in a sentiment of opposition to the tariff of 1842, desired to see it changed. That act was believed to be extreme in its protective character, and therefore unequal and unsatisfactory to large sections of the Union; and our aim was, to modify it by the nearest possible approach to that happy mean between the extreme opinions of such as demand a total abandonment of all protection on one hand, and of those who insist upon protection as a primary object, on the other. I have no doubt that this is the only foundation upon which wise and just legislation can be based, when interests really conflicting are to be affected by the action of the general government. Conferences with each other, and with the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, [Mr. McKay,] were frequently held, as to the best mode of altering and reforming the tariff of 1842. The more eminent men of the democratic party in the Senate, and leading statesmen from different sections of the Union in Congress, took part in the deliberations and investigations which preceded and accompanied the formation of what was then called and known as "McKay's bill and report," viz: in March, 1844. In the councils whence that bill proceeded, I had the honor to be admitted as an humble and unpretending participator, so that I knew, and it cannot be denied, that quite all the democratic senators from the south and west, and very nearly every one from the north and east, assented to or acquiesced in it. It formed a subject of congratulation, I remember, amongst the members of the party from all sections at that time, (1844,) that the opinions and views of democrats in the national councils had been thus brought to harmonize in what was thought to be a reasonable, prudent, practical measure of legislation upon this subject, which seemed likely to put at rest and settle the tariff dispute. Unfortunately, it did not pass the House of Representatives: I will not stop to state the cause. But, notwithstanding its temporary defeat in that body, the democratic party at once put themselves before the people of the Union upon that bill as a common platform, and it was promulgated as their proposed scheme of reforming the tariff act of 1842. "McKay's report" of 1844 was published and sent forth as the true and authentic interpretation of their views in regard to the change we were afterwards to insist upon. So I understood it at the time, and ever since, and so have I constantly declared. The bill was named after its author and advocate, [Mr. McKay,] a statesman of North Carolina—a southern man and a democrat. My own opinions in its favor were freely expressed in all my intercourse with you, and they were not unknown in any quarter. The democratic press in North Carolina, without exception, applauded it; the democratic party zealously approved of it throughout our limits. If there was a single one of them who did not, I am yet to learn the fact. Hundreds—if not thousands—of the other party in our State gave their approving voice in its favor. Our elections in 1844 and in 1845, all of them, were conducted upon that basis, so far as the tariff question entered into them at all. Every intelligent man in the nation knows the fact that the fall elections of 1844, and those in the spring of 1845, throughout the United States, for members to the present Congress were carried on, if not upon the same basis, with a knowledge of that bill and report. The north saw in it a pledge of the *south* and west that we did not mean to break down and oppress the labor and industry of the north and east; the south saw in it a reasonable concession to their demand for practical free trade; the people everywhere saw in it the hope for moderate legislation, and the prospect of a permanent arrangement of a question that had been agitating the nation for a quarter of a century; and if your memory still serves you with a recollection of any of the speeches of our candidates for the last legislature or the present Congress, made in North Carolina only a year ago, I beg to know whether it was not uniformly proclaimed that all *true* democrats were going in favor of "McKay's bill" of 1844! Bear in mind that the "McKay bill" of 1844 and the McKay bill of 1846 agree in nothing but the name, as I will show you hereafter.

And what, let me ask, was the result of all this? In the north, as well as the south and west, the elections to the present Congress ended favorably to the democratic party. A democratic majority of more than sixty were returned to the House of Representatives. The same party held a majority in the Senate. And a democratic President, nominated after the "McKay bill" of 1844 had been framed and approved by the party, was elected by the votes of States in the north as well as the south; a southern and a western President, whom we could not have elected without the votes of northern States. Of course I cannot undertake to affirm, as a fact, that the northern States which voted for the democratic party were induced to do it by McKay's bill and report of 1844. But this I know, and will say, that it was put forth as a political peace-offering upon the tariff, and that the northern people at once rallied to the support of the party in numbers largely beyond those which had theretofore supported it, and that it *was expected by us when that offering was made, that it would conciliate the northern democrats;* and I have no doubt that it enlisted the support of thousands who would not have sustained the party without it. Now, then, I put it to the conscience of the people of North Carolina—who I know love all their country, north, south, east, and west—whether, under such circumstances, I was bound to violate my sense of duty, and, contrary alike to this party-pledge and to my own sober judgment as a senator, to assent to an act which violated out and out the "McKay bill" of 1844, when there was no public emergency to require it, and no national exigency to excuse it, and that, when I did most confidently believe that the new tariff act of the present Congress was in itself unwise and full of mischief to the republic? Was it my duty to you, or to the democratic party of North Carolina, to have done that? And had I no right to resign and retire from it? Was I bound to hold on to my office, and put up the pretended excuse that the democrats of North Carolina had changed their minds, and repudiated "McKay's bill" of 1844, for a new and different measure in 1846?—or that the people desired me to pass the latter, when, forsooth, I did not know the fact to be so, and in my heart I did not believe it? So far from its being the case, I more than doubt whether thousands of you have not taken it for granted, or been led to believe, down to this day, that the "McKay bill" of 1844 was the same thing that is called so in 1846; whereas they are as different as light is from darkness. No, my constituents never required such things of me.

Believe me, I do not mean to bring into question the course of other democratic senators who condemned the act, and yet gave it their vote. It is my right to state that there were not a few of them who did that. Neither do I mean by this to assail my friend Mr. McKay. Far from it. They are my friends personally and politically, and in taking a different view of their duty, they did me no wrong; and in defending my own conduct, I intend not to arraign theirs. Whilst I have pursued the light of my conscience, they have followed theirs. In questions of conscience it must be conceded that GOD is the judge, and every man must stand or fall according as each believes for himself. So that not unfrequently there are cases where men in the same circumstances may act differently, and yet both be guiltless.

But what I have said upon the history and purpose of the "McKay bill" of 1844 did not form all of my objection to the new tariff of 1846, improperly named "McKay's bill;" and which I shall, for the sake of discrimination, more properly call the "experimental tariff."

My opinions shall be laid before you without disguise, and you shall see whether, taken in connexion with an unnecessary and improper abandonment of the real McKay bill of 1844, they do not show that, in my hostility to the experimental tariff, I was faithful to you and my country, and true to myself and my party.

Fortunately for me, those opinions, so far as they looked forward to its ultimate consequences, on the harmony of the party, or the welfare of the republic, I am no longer under the necessity of supporting by labored arguments. For good or evil, the law has passed. If it should be repealed or modified at the next session, that will be of itself a complete vindication of my opposition to it at the present. If it should be permitted to remain in force in the form I was required to vote upon it, then time will soon determine whether my opinion of it was right or wrong. I abide the result without fear; yet, if I know myself, without a wish to see evil come of it, merely for the sake of claiming hereafter the merit of political sagacity for my resistance to it.

These, then, were my opinions, as they are now:

First. Our country is involved in an expensive war, and the wisest among you cannot foresee its close. We have a large army invading Mexico, and a large navy off her coasts, along the Pacific Ocean and in the Gulf of Mexico. The sum already appropriated by Congress for the government expenditures of the fiscal year, exceeds FIFTY MILLIONS of dollars. Will the experimental tariff raise revenue sufficient to "pay as we go?" Certainly not. Congress knew that, and, therefore, authorized a loan of ten millions, at the very time we are passing this tariff; and the first act of the next session will probably be one for ten millions more? Will it produce revenue enough to pay *one-half* of the appropriations? I am quite sure it will not. Its advocates did not assert that it will do much more. Wherefore, if this experiment works as well as its warmest friends have predicted, the government will fall in debt twenty-five millions this (fiscal) year. So long as the war lasts, and for such a period of time after it as the war expenses continue, it will be the same thing. But if the experiment works as ill as its more violent opponents have said of it, why then it will hardly go at all. I think the the truth lies between them. It will work, but it will work badly, and work you deeply in debt; and if it is adhered to "without alteration," the public debt will be increased, not much short of THIRTY MILLIONS the first year, and I can see no way to prevent its yearly increase, except by a resort to direct taxes.

Direct taxes ought to be our very last resort. Public debt is an evil that I abhor more than ever since I was a member of Congress; and therefore it was the conclusion of my mind, that this tariff experiment ought not to be tried, and certainly not at this particular time. The acts of a Congress which went to diminish the revenue, but to increase the expenditures, did not seem to me to be consistent with prudence in any government, more especially in a time of war. The tariff system, according to my judgement, was a most unfit subject for party experiments; and, at the time of a yearly expenditure of fifty millions of dollars, and of a foreign war, such experiments amounted to party rashness. If the war should end soon, still the government here, we knew, expected to terminate it by a treaty for peace and a new territory, viz: California. No honest country would take the territory without paying the owner for it, and if we would, Mexico cannot yield it upon any other terms. Hence, whether we were to have peace or war with Mexico, we needed much more money to carry on the government. When the plainest rules of arithmetic and common sense thus compelled me to withhold my support from a tariff experiment, to be made now, at the expense of the nation's credit, how could I hesitate?

Second. The tariff of 1842 ought to have been modified, but not by an act which reduced the duties as early as the 1st December.

In all great alterations of the tariff diminishing duties, the reductions ought to be made upon reasonable notice to the people, whose property and business will be affected by them. In that case, there may be inconvenience to some, but it does not bring down ruin upon so many innocent people. Not giving time, infant factories are destroyed by the hand of legislation, and the older and more mature establishments, are compelled to diminish their operations forthwith, and consequently to discharge a number of their laborers and reduce the wages of all. The laborers suffer more than the owners, because they are less able to bear it. The sudden loss of work will be to many of them and their families a loss of food and raiment, and that which the law-maker is commanded to pray for—his "daily bread"—he would be thus rudely taking by law from the workingman of his country. And the experimental tariff act was the more objectionable, inasmuch as many of our countrymen—the northern laborers, who are to suffer under it—will be put out of employment in the beginning of winter, when other employment will be obtained with great difficulty; and at the north, the poor, without labor and without wages, encounter a degree of suffering, in that inclement season, which we have no just conception of at the south. You must see it, before you can fully appreciate it. Also, a sudden alteration of the tariff must, of necessity, disturb the home market of our manufacturers, coal-diggers, and mechanics, and involve hundreds and thousands—in losses to some, ruin to others, and suffering to many.

Even a bad tariff law, then, should not be repealed so as to fall down too hastily, when its gradual abrogation would create less inconvenience to the government, and its sudden change may oppress the poor, or do injutice to any section. The government ought to have compassion on all the people, and particularly upon the laboring classes. The manufacturers at the north are not all "Abbott Lawrences," whose fortune has been the theme of so many tariff speeches. The compromise tariff act, under General Jackson, in 1833, reduced the duties gradually and periodically for nine years. *It* gave nine years' notice. *This experimental tariff* will reduce all the duties upon only four months' notice! The latter was harsh, cruel, unjust legislation—harsh to the wealthy, cruel to the laborer, and unjust to both; and the general welfare did not require it.

Third. The independent treasury, of itself a great change; the warehousing act, another; and the experimental tariff, the greatest of them all, —will, when taken together, work an entire revolution of our financial system. One at a time they might have been introduced more safely, some of them wisely. But by being so nearly united, as they will be, in the time of their commencement, it is calculated to excite apprehension and alarm. To put them into simultaneous operation, was, indeed, a political movement of party, too violent and too potent for good. They will affect all the business of the people most injuriously; and, with a government expenditure of fifty millions, and a revenue under twenty millions, the government itself, may be crushed under their combined operation. To attempt it, when the nation was at war abroad, and the government was in the money-market, or soon expected there, as a borrower at home, clearly appeared to my mind to be unwisely jeoparding public credit and private confidence. Revolutions are seldom reforms, and certainly reforms need not always be revolutions. One must reasonbly fear that, without a miracle, such strong measures, acting with their combined powers against the existing order of things in the country, may create a revulsion in trade, pecuniary distress, hard times, popular excitements, and sectional agitations, preceding another contest for the presidency, and do nobody any good, but a few political agitators and rich speculators. I thought they would go very far towards producing an overthrow of the democratic party, if they did not entirely accomplish it. These consequences were too natural not to be apprehended; and the last mentioned result was openly predicted by some, and probably anticipated by others, of my own friends, who yet voted for the experimental tariff bill, without approving of it. Unless it should be repealed or materially modified, its consequences now, belong to the developments of the future; so I need not illustrate the grounds of my conviction by minuter statements. Let time test its correctness.

Fourth. In none of the tariff acts of the United States in former years was the industry of our own country burdened by the discriminations made *against* home manufactures. Their policy was to build up, and not to destroy—to protect and not to oppress. No so the experimental tariff. And is it not a mistake to suppose that the republican people of North Carolina were at any time hostile to those acts merely because they were "*protective?*" Our hostility was aimed at the *extent* of the thing, not the *thing* itself—at *extreme* protection, not protection *per se.* With here and there an individual exception (for republicans in those days were allowed to differ) I boldly affirm that this was the republican doctrine of our State; and the people will know it to be true, when I remind them that it was precisely the point of our dispute with the nullifiers. They were against protection *out and out.* We, the (Jackson) republican party of North Carolina, in particular, went for *incidental* protection—*moderate* protection, by a "judicious tariff." They were for declaring the tariff of 1828 and 1832 unconstitutional, and nullifying it because it *protected* manufactures. We thought it was unjust, because the protection was *extreme,* but not unconstitutional, and that the "Union must be preserved." What the republican party of North Carolina thought then, I thought, and spoke, and wrote.

And coming down to more recent events, let me say, that McKay's bill of 1844 was a tariff of incidental protection, which you and I, and all the democrats in Congress from North Carolina, approved and sustained, and the people of our party, in North Carolina, nowhere opposed last year, and the press of the party defended up to the inauguration and afterwards, and even down to the day of the report from the present Secretary of the Treasury. Careful study, longer experience, and close examination, have confirmed me in the faith of those times, fortified, as it was, by the authority of the administrations of *Washington* and *Jefferson,* and *Madison,* and *Monroe,* and *Jackson,* all southern republicans and southern Presidents. Is consistency treason? It may be a misfortune to me that I was unable to change with the times, but it would be a crime to deny my faith. To avoid misrepresentation, I give you the words of those wise and eminent patriotic men. Hear Washington:

Extract of a speech of George Washington, President of the United States, to Congress, January 8, 1790.

"A free people ought not only to be armed, but disciplined, to which end a uniform and well-digested plan is requisite; and their safety and interest require that they should promote such *manufactories* as tend to render them independent of others for essential, particularly military, supplies."

"The advancement of agriculture, commerce, and *manufactures, by all proper means, will not, I trust, need recommendation.*"

In accordance with this general recommendation, the House of Representatives passed a resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Hamilton) to report to them upon the subject of manufactures, and particularly as to the means of promoting such as would tend to render the United States independent of foreign nations for military and other essential supplies; and his report was submitted in December, 1791, wherein he said:

"The expediency of manufactures in the United States, which was not long since deemed very questionable, appears at this time to be pretty generally admitted."—P. 123.

And again he said:

"A question has been made concerning the constitutional right of the government of the United States to apply this species of encouragement, [to manufactures,] but there is certainly no good foundation for such a question."—P. 136.

And again he said:

"It is not uncommon to meet with an opinion, that, though the promoting of manufactures may be the interest of a part of the Union, it is contrary to that of any other part. The northern and southern regions are sometimes represented as having adverse interests in this respect. Those are called manufacturing, these agricultural States; and a species of opposition is imagined to subsist between the manufacturing and agricultural interests.

"Ideas of a contrariety of interests between the northern and southern interests of the Union are, in the main, as unfounded as they are mischievous. The diversity of circumstances on which such contrariety is usually predicted, authorizes a directly contrary conclusion. Mutual wants constitute one of the strongest links of polical connexion; and the extent of these bears a natural proportion to the diversity in the means of mutual supply. Suggestions of an opposite complexion are ever to be deplored, as unfriendly to the steady pursuit of one great common cause, and to the perfect harmony of all its parts."—P. 134. (See State Papers, Finances, vol. 1, pages 123, 134, and 136.)

These were the doctrines of Washington, and of Washington's administration. And now hear Washington again!

Extract of a speech of Geo. Washington, President of the United States, to Congress, December 7, 1796.

"Congress have repeatedly, and not without success, directed their attention to the *encouragement of manufactures.* The object is of too much consequence not to insure a *continuance* of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible."

Hear Jefferson!

Extract of a message from Thomas Jefferson, President of the United States, to Congress, November 8, 1808.

"The suspension of our foreign commerce, produced by the injustice of the belligerent powers, (of Europe,) and the consequent losses and sacrifices of our citizens, are subjects of just concern. The situation into which we have thus been forced has impelled us to apply a portion of our industry and capital to internal manufactures and improvements. The extent of this conversion is daily increasing, and little doubt remains that the establishments formed and forming will, under the auspices of cheaper materials and sub-istence, the freedom of labor from taxation with us, and of PROTECTING DUTIES AND PROHIBITIONS, become permanent."

Hear Madison!

Extract of a message from James Madison, President of the United States, to Congress, November 5, 1811.

"Although other subjects will press more immediately on your deliberations, a portion of them cannot but be well bestowed on the just and sound policy of securing to our manufacturers the success they have attained, and are still attaining, in some degree, under the impulse of causes not permanent.

"Besides the reasonableness of saving our manufactures from sacrifices which a change of circumstances might bring on them, the national interest requires that, with respect to such articles at least as belong to our defence and our *primary* wants, we should not be left in unnecessary dependence on external supplies."

Extract of a message from James Madison, President of the United States, to Congress, December 5, 1815.

"In adjusting the *duties on imports* to the object of revenue, the influence of the tariff on *manufactures* will necessarily present itself for consideration. However wise the theory may be which leaves to the sagacity and interest of individuals the application of their industry and resources, there are in this, as in other cases, exceptions to the general rule. Besides the condition, which the theory itself implies, of a reciprocal adoption by other nations, experience teaches that so many circumstances must concur in introducing and maturing manufacturing establishments, especially of the more complicated kinds, that a country may remain long without them, although sufficiently advanced, and in some respects even peculiarly fitted for carrying them on with success. Under circumstances giving a powerful impulse to manufacturing industry, it has made among us a progress, and exhibited an efficiency, which justify the belief that, with a *protection not more than is due to the enterprising citizens whose interests are now at stake,* it will become, at an early day, not only safe against occasional competitions from abroad, but a source of domestic wealth, and even of external commerce. In selecting the branches more especially entitled to the public patronage, a preference is obviously claimed by such as will relieve the United States from a dependence on foreign supplies, ever subject to casual failures, for articles necessary for the public defence, or connected with the primary wants of individuals. It will be an additional recommendation of particular manufactures, where the materials of them are extensively drawn from our agriculture, and consequently impart and insure to that great fund of national prosperity and independence an encouragement which cannot fail to be rewarded."

Hear Monroe!

Extract of a Message from James Monroe, President of the United States, to Congress, December 7, 1819.

"It is deemed of great importance to give encouragement to our domestic manufacturers. In what manner the evils which have been adverted to may be remedied, and how far it may be practicable in other respects to afford to them further encouragement, paying due regard to the other great interests of the nation, is submitted to the wisdom of Congress."

Extract of a message from James Monroe, President of the United States, to Congress, December 3, 1822.

"From the best information that I have been able to obtain, it appears that our manufactures, though depressed immediately after the peace, have considerably increased, and are still increasing, under the encouragement given them by the tariff of 1816, and by subsequent laws. Satisfied I am, whatever may be the abstract doctrine in favor of unrestricted commerce, provided all nations would concur in it, and it was not liable to be interrupted by war, which has never occured, and cannot be expected, that there are other strong reasons applicable to our situation and relations with other countries, which impose on us the obligation to *cherish and sustain our manufactures.* Satisfied however, I likewise am, that the interest of every part of our Union, even of those most benefited by manufactures, requires that this subject should be touched with the greatest caution, and a critical knowledge of the effect to be produced by the slightest change. On full consideration of the subject in all its relations, I am persuaded that a further augmentation may now be made of the duties on certain foreign articles, in favor of our own, and without affecting injuriously any other interest."

Extract of a message from James Monroe, President of the United States, to Congress, December 2, 1823.

"Having communicated my views to Congress, at the commencement of the last session, respecting the encouragement which ought to be given to our manufactures, and the principle on which it should be founded, I have only to add, that those views remain unchanged; and that the present state of those countries with which we have the most immediate political relations and greatest commercial intercourse tends to confirm them. Under this impression I recommend a review of the *tariff,* for the purpose of affording such additional *protection* to those articles which we are prepared to *manufacture,* or which are more immediately connected with the defence and independence of the country."

Hear Jackson!

Extract of a message from Andrew Jackson, President of the United States, to Congress, December 8, 1829.

"No very considerable change has occurred, during the recess of Congress, in the condition of either our agriculture, commerce, or manufactures.

"To regulate its conduct so as to promote equally the prosperity of these three cardinal interests, is one of the most difficult tasks of government; and it may be regretted that the complicated restrictions which now embarrass the intercourse of nations could not, by common consent, be abolished, and commerce allowed to flow in those channels to which individual enterprise—always its surest guide—might direct it. But we must ever expect selfish legislation in other nations, and are therefore compelled to adapt our own to their regulations, in the manner best calculated to avoid serious injury, and to harmonize the conflicting interests of our agriculture, our commerce, and our manufactures. Under these impressions, I invite your attention to the existing tariff, believing that some of its provisions require modification.

"The general rule to be applied in graduating the duties upon articles of foreign growth or manufacture, is that which will place our own in fair competition with those of other countries; and *the inducements to advance even a step beyond this point are controlling in regard to those articles which are of primary necessity in time of war.* When we reflect upon the difficulty and delicacy of this operation, it is important that it should never be attempted but with the utmost caution. *Frequent legislation in regard to any branch of industry affecting its value, and by which its capital may be transferred to new channels, must always be productive of hazardous speculations and loss.*

"In deliberating, therefore, on those interesting subjects, local feelings and prejudices should be merged in the patriotic determination to promote the great interest of the whole. All attempts to connect them with the party conflicts of the day are necessarily injurious, and should be discountenanced. Our action upon them should be under the control of higher and purer motives. Legislation subjected to such influences can never be just, and will not long retain the sanction of a people whose active patriotism is not bounded by sectional limits, nor insensible to that spirit of concession and forbearance which gave life to our political compact, and still sustains it. Discarding all calculations of political ascendency, the north, the south, the east, and the west should unite in diminishing any burden of which either may justly complain.

"The agricultural interest of our country is so essentially connected with every other, and so superior in importance to them all, that it is scarcely necessary to invite to it your particular attention. *It is principally as manufactures and commerce tend to increase the value of agricultural productions and to extend their application to the wants and comforts of society, that they deserve the fostering care of government.*

"Looking forward to the period, not far distant, when a sinking fund will no longer be required, the duties on those articles of importation *which cannot come in competition with our own production are the first that should engage the attention of Congress in the modification of the tariff. Of these, tea and coffee are the most prominent;* they enter largely into the consumption of the country, and have become articles of necessity to all classes."

Extract of a message from Andrew Jackson, President of the United States, to Congress, December 7, 1830.

"Among the numerous causes of congratulation, the condition of our impost revenue deserves special mention, inasmuch as it promises the means of extinguishing the public debt sooner than was anticipated, and furnishes a strong illustration of the practical effects of the present tariff upon our commercial interests.

"The object of the tariff is objected to by some as unconstitutional; and it is considered by almost all as defective in many of its parts.

"The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust those duties, with a view to the *encouragement of the domestic branches of industry,* is so completely incidental to that power that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the general government, without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them; and consequently if it be not possessed by the general government, it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry, and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely cannot be the case. This indispensable power, thus surrendered by the States, must be within the scope of the authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress.

"In this conclusion I am confirmed, as well by the opinions of President Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the constitution, as by the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people.

"That our deliberations on this interesting subject should be *uninfluenced by those partisan conflicts that are incident to free institutions, is the fervent wish of my heart.* To make this great question, which unhappily so much divides and excites the public mind, subservient to the short-sighted views of faction, must destroy all hope of settling it satisfactorily to the great body of the people, and for the general interest. I cannot, therefore, in taking leave of the subject, too earnestly, for my own feelings or the common good, warn you against the blighting consequences of such a course."

Extract of a message from Andrew Jackson, President of the United States, to Congress, Dec. 6, 1831.

"The confidence with which the extinguishment of the public debt may be anticipated presents an opportunity for carrying into effect more fully the policy in relation to import duties, which has been recommended in my former messages. A modification of the tariff, which shall produce a reduction of our revenue to the wants of the government, and an adjustment of the duties on imports, with a view to equal justice in relation to all our national interests, and to the counteraction of foreign policy, so far as it may be injurious to those interests, is deemed to be one of the principal objects which demand the consideration of the present Congress. In the exercise of that spirit of concession and conciliation which has distinguished the friends of our Union in all great emergencies, it is believed that this object may be effected without injury to any national interest."

Now, the experimental tariff, as I interpret it, fundamentally violated this doctrine. It discriminated, but it did so *against* our domestic labor; and in that way, and to that extent, it made war upon the vital interests of the north. And pray, what inducements were offered to North Carolina, by this experiment, that her senators should help to carry on the unnatural conflict? What, but the naked desire for an apparent party unity where there was really no party concord. For North Carolina had no local or State interest which would be served or elevated by it. None whatever.

The limits of this address will not allow of illustrations by a tedious detail of enumerated articles. I reserve that for a more suitable occasion, only remarking, for the present, that should any be disingenuous enough to deny this characteristic of the new tariff, no one, who regards his reputation, will venture to contradict the fact, that the experimental tariff does not discriminate in *favor* of American manufacturers; and not to discriminate in their favor, moderately and reasonbly, by a "live and let live" law of love amongst brethren of a common country, is the same thing in principle, though not in degree, as to discriminate